

Applicant : Robert H. Mimplitch, et al.  
Serial No. : 10/622,402  
Filed : July 18, 2003  
Page : 7 of 8

Attorney Docket No.: 14489-009001

## REMARKS

Claims 26-35, 37, 38, 41-42 are pending. Claims 24, 25, 36, 39, and 40 were cancelled without prejudice. Claim 43 has been withdrawn. Claims 3, 5, 13, 26, 31, 34, 35, 37, and 41 have been amended. Claims 26, 31, and 41 have been made independent claims.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 26-30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 41, and 42 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. In view of the claim amendments, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

### Claim Objections

In the Office Action, claims 27 and 34 were objected to because of informalities. Claim 34 has been amended to address the concerns expressed in the Office Action. The Office Action states “[i]n line 1 of claim 27, it is suggested that ‘comprises’ be changed to ‘defines.’” (Office Action, page 3). Applicant uses “comprises” in claim 27 to introduce terminology to clearly distinguish between the “center slide member” and the “outer slide member” throughout the rest of the claim and subsequent claims. Thus, Applicant believes it is unnecessary to change the claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 27 be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 25, 31, 34, 35, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 25 and 40 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 31, 34, and 35 have been amended to address the concerns expressed in the Office Action.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this

Applicant : Robert H. Mimplitch, et al.  
Serial No. : 10/622,402  
Filed : July 18, 2003  
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney Docket No.: 14489-009001

paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Conclusion

The fee in the amount of \$100 for payment of additional claims is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 08/21/2006

/Elizabeth Philip Dahm/

Elizabeth Philip Dahm  
Reg. No. 51,352

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1717 Main Street  
Suite 5000  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Telephone: (214) 760-6119  
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091